



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In fact, Roger is so drunk that his rage against the caviling Maunciple is speechless, and he is put in a good humor again only by another drink of wine (*C. T.*, H., 25-85). He is precisely the kind of man one might expect to claw the Reeve on the back for joy of a dirty tale (A, 4326), and to begin one of his own which fortunately ends where we are told that the heroine 'swyved for hir sustenance' (A, 4422). His acquaintance with such characters has probably been too intimate for his own good.

WALTER CLYDE CURRY.

Vanderbilt University.

JOSEPH WARTON'S CRITICISM OF POPE

Anyone who is familiar with Joseph Warton's criticism, must be aware that his notes to Pope's Works often bear a close resemblance to his *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*, which preceded them by many years. But probably not many people have troubled to collate the *Essay* and the notes in detail. The comparison made by the present writer has produced some curious results, which, pending publication in full, it is worth while to summarize for the benefit of future students. Briefly, the *Essay* has been cut up into notes, in such a way that practically none of it, not even the most garrulous and irrelevant afterthought, has been omitted in the later works. Sometimes, when a paragraph or a sentence appears to have been left out, it is discovered afterwards in an altogether different context. The parallel passages run into more than a hundred closely written pages, and they leave one marvelling at Warton's absurdly exaggerated sense of the importance of anything and everything that he had once written. The *Essay* was an original and daring piece of criticism, which marked the author out as an independent thinker, who refused to bow the head to the "common-sense" verdicts of his day. To venture to say in 1756 that Pope was a great Wit, but that he was not among the greatest poets, "not, assuredly in the same rank with Spenser, Shakespeare and Milton," was to throw down a challenge to accepted opinions. Warton goes further. Point by point, and poem by poem, he proves wherein Pope's achievements and shortcomings lie. Pope is the poet of rationalism; he produces nothing that is "of the most poetic species of poetry," for he is deficient in the sublime and

pathetic, which are its "main nerves"; he writes "from and to the Head rather than the Heart," "A clear head and acute understanding are not sufficient, alone, to make a poet"; even more essential is "a creative and glowing imagination." On the other hand, Warton recognizes and gives due weight to Pope's conciseness and epigrammatic force, the excellence of his versification, and, in the Moral Epistles, his "clear, complete and circumstantial images."

One is therefore ready to find Warton a discerning editor, who will have much that is valuable to contribute by way of comment and elucidation. In a sense, this is the case, for the *Essay* is to a considerable extent a detailed examination of the text of Pope's poems, combined with much information from hitherto unpublished sources, such as Spence's *Anecdotes*, about the life and opinions of the poet. It does not enhance one's opinion of the critic, however, to find that he has comparatively little to add, forty years later, to the opinions he has already expressed, and that he is content to repeat what he has said in the same words, with the same discursiveness, verbosity, and lack of method, and introducing the same irrelevant stories or allusions to prove the width of his reading. If we ignore merely graphical and verbal changes, a few examples may serve as illustrations of his methods:

(1) In the Life of Pope, at the beginning of the *Works*, pp. lxxviii to lxx, Warton uses pp. 408 l. 5 to 410 l. 19 of the second volume of the *Essay*, 1782, 4th edition (N. B. Vol. II was published for the first time in that year). The passage is too long for quotation in its entirety, but a few sentences are typical of the way in which he patches together his earlier work.

Works.

P. lxxviii. His whole thoughts, time and talents were spent on his Works alone: which Works, if we dispassionately and carefully review, we shall find, that the largest portion of them, for he attempted nothing of the epic and dramatic, is of the didactic, moral, and satiric kind; and consequently, not of the most poetic species of Poetry. There is nothing in so sublime a style as The Bard of Gray. . . No man can

Essay.

Vol. II, p. 408, l. 5. Thus have I endeavoured to give a critical account . . . of each of Pope's Works; by which review it will appear that the *largest* portion of them is of the didactic, moral, and satiric kind; and consequently, not of the most poetic species of poetry; whence it is manifest, that *good sense* and *judgment* were his characteristic excellencies, rather than fancy and invention.

Works (Cont'd)

possibly think, or can hint, that the Author of the *Rape of the Lock*, and the *Eloisa*, wanted imagination, or *sensibility*, or *pathetic*; but he certainly did not so often indulge and exert those talents, nor give so many proofs of them as he did of strong sense and judgment.

P. lxx. Malignant and insensible must be the critic, who should impotently dare to assert, that *Pope* wanted *genius* and *imagination*; but perhaps it may safely be affirmed, that his *peculiar* and *characteristical* excellencies were good sense and judgment. And this was the opinion of Atterbury and Bolingbroke.

It is like fitting a puzzle together to trace the different clauses, and one cannot feel sure that a missing sentence may not, after all, turn up on a further examination of the texts. Warton himself, must certainly have re-read his *Essay* many times in order to make sure he had omitted no phrase that could by any possibility be utilized again.

Works.

(2) I, 151, *ver.* 108. I am afraid there is a trivial antithesis betwixt the words *snows* and *glows*, unworthy our author.

Ver. 112. The death is expressed with a brevity and abruptness suitable to the nature of the ode. Instead of *he sung*, Virgil says *vocabat*, which is more natural and tender, and adds a moving epithet, that he called *miseram* Eurydicen. . . .

Essays (Cont'd)

II, 410, l. 19, and he has written nothing in a strain so truly sublime, as The Bard of Gray.

II, 408, not that the author of *The Rape of the Lock*, and *Eloisa* can be thought to want *imagination*; but because his *imagination* was not his predominant talent, because he indulged it not, and because he gave not so many proofs of *this* talent as of the *other*.

Vol. I, p. 115. *Footnote.* Atterbury and Bolingbroke had the very same opinion of the bent and turn of our author's genius (*et seq.*).

Essay.

I, 59, l. 19. "he *glows* amid Rhodope's *snows*," which I hope the poet did not intend as it would be a trivial and puerile conceit. The death of Orpheus is expressed with a beautiful brevity and abruptness, suitable to the nature of the ode: . . .

P. 60, l. 4. Instead of *sung*, Virgil says *vocabat*, which is more natural and tender; and Virgil adds a very moving epithet that he calls *miseram* Eurydicen.

The above, at any rate, is perfectly straightforward transference, and such is usual in the notes to particular verses. It is in the longer sections, the introductory note or final general criticism on

a poem, that the piecing-together is most remarkable. Here too there are the most striking deviations, whether in the form of omission or addition. (3) Thus the "Final Note" to the Odes (*Works* I, 152) but for a few verbal changes, corresponds exactly to the *Essay*, I, pp. 66 to 68, but it adds at the end a quotation of some lines from a comment of Gray, not found in any edition of the *Essay*:

"We have had (says Mr. Gray) in our language, other odes of the sublime kind, than that of Dryden on St. Cecilia's Day: for Cowley, who had his merit, yet wanted judgment, style, and harmony for such a task. That of Pope is not worthy of so great a master. Mr. Mason, indeed of late days, has touched the true chords, and with a masterly hand, in some of his chorusses; above all in the last of Caractacus;

"Hark! heard yet not you footsteps dread?" etc.

Gray's *Works*, 4to., page 25.

(4) Similarly, a few pages further on (p. 158) at the end of the Final note to chorus of Athenians, which comes bodily from the *Essay* I, 71-75, there is the following addition:

"But what shall we say to the strong objections lately made by some very able and learned critics to the use of the chorus at all? The critics I have in view, are Metastasio, Twining, Pye, Colman, and Johnson; who have brought forward such powerful arguments against this, so important a part of the ancient drama, as to shake our conviction of its utility and propriety, founded on what Hurd, Mason, and Brumoy, have so earnestly and elegantly urged on the subject."

Comparing this with the note which has immediately preceded, we find that Warton retains his openness to new impressions, and that he is not afraid to change his mind, even though he objects to sacrifice his nicely rounded periods.

Sometimes, as in the next example, the parallels are different in kind from those hitherto selected. The substance of a passage is utilized again, but the whole is compressed and considerably changed:

Works.

(5) I, p. 255, vr. 667. This dissolute and effeminate writer little deserved a place among good critics, for only two or three pages on the subject of criticism. His fragment on the Civil War is far below Lucan, whom he endeavoured to blame and to excel. Sir George Wheeler, esteemed an accurate traveller, informs us that he saw at Trau, in the hands of a Doctor Statelius, a fragment of Petronius, in which the account of the Supper of Trimalcion was entire. Yet the fragment has been judged to be spurious.

Essay.

I, p. 176. For what merit Petronius should be placed among useful critics, I could never discern. There are not above two or three pages containing critical remarks in his work; the chief merit of which is that of telling a story with grace and ease. His own style is more affected than even that of his contemporaries, when the Augustan simplicity was laid aside. Many of his metaphors are far-fetched, and mixed. His character of Horace, however celebrated and so often quoted as to become nauseous, "Horatii curiosa felicitas," is surely a very unclassical inversion; for he ought to have called it the *happy carefulness* of Horace, rather than his *careful happiness*. I shall observe, by the way, that the copy of this author found some years ago, bears many signatures of its spuriousness, and particularly of its being forged by a Frenchman. For we have this expression, "ad Castellâ sese receperunt"; that is, "to their Chateaux," instead of "ad Villas." They who maintain the genuineness of these fragments of Petronius, will find it difficult to answer the objections of Burman and Perizonius.

(6) In dealing with Volume II of the *Essay*, Warton proceeds methodically to chop up the first 54 pp. for notes to *Works*, Vol. II, pp. 143 to p. 300. But from p. 54 he jumps to p. 390 for the concluding notes of Vol. II, going steadily to p. 402, except for one deviation. The footnote, namely, on p. 400, is transferred to Vol. I of the *Works*, p. lxi, instead of being used where we should expect to find it in Vol. II.

These examples must suffice to indicate Warton's conception of his duties as an editor, and his method of superseding his predecessor, Warburton. But they do not do justice to his unwearied industry in readapting his material.

Nor can the edition be judged merely by a comparison of the parallel passages, even when this is made in detail. It is more than merely a reissue in a new form of Warton's most original contribution to criticism. But the parallels are so numerous that they are worthy of note, and they cannot be ignored by anyone who wishes to form a just estimate of Warton's editorial and critical work. There seems good reason to believe that the edition of Pope's *Works* was undertaken as a "pot-boiler" and as a means of attacking Warburton, rather than because the worthy doctor had anything of importance to add to his earlier, bold exaltation of imaginative poets at the expense of "the great Poet of Reason, the First of Ethical authors in verse."

EDITH J. MORLEY.

University College, Reading, England.

DAVENPORT'S *THE CITY NIGHTCAP* AND GREENE'S *PHILOMELA*

Since the days of Isaac Reed it has been known that the plot of Davenport's play, *The City Nightcap or Crede Quod Habes et Habes*, was taken partly from Robert Greene's novel, *Philomela the Lady Fitzwaters Nightingale*. I have not been able to find, however, that a study has been made of the exact relations between the two works. With a previous interest essentially in Robert Greene I have made such a comparison, aiming to ascertain how far the form of the play was determined by that of the novel.

The City Nightcap consists of two stories, that which Davenport took from Greene, and that which is told in the *Decameron* (Day 7, Novel 7), the two being in striking contrast. The part derived from Greene's novel deals with the jealous husband and the faithful wife; that derived from Boccaccio, with the confident husband and the wanton wife. The two stories are told with little connection between them.

Davenport has changed Greene's proper names. The scene is in Verona instead of in Venice, with the Duke of Verona as cousin to the jealous husband, who in the play is called Lorenzo Medico, instead of Phillippo. The friend, Giovanni Lutesio, of the novel,